

## REMARKS

5

Claims 1-41 stand pending in the present application. Claims 1-11, 14-23, 29-38, and 40-41 stand under examination at this time. Claims 12-13, 24-28, and 39 stand withdrawn at this time.

10

The Examiner has restated an election requirement. In response to the previous Office Action applicant confirmed election of the Species I. Applicant understands claims 1-11, 14-24, 29-37, and 40-41 are considered generic and thereby read on Species I. Claim 38, referencing a stationary air knife, can be applied to the elected Species I as FIG. 4 is described in the specification. Applicant affirms the election of Species I.

15

The Examiner maintains objection to the drawings, noting that the reference numeral "114b" of FIG. 5 is not mentioned in the specification. Applicant provides herewith a replacement sheet for FIG. 5 omitting reference numeral "114b" and its lead line therefrom.

20

Accordingly, applicant submits that the objection to the drawings may be withdrawn.

Claim 31 stands under objection for alleged grammatical error. Claim 31 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

25

Accordingly the objection to claim 31 may be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 8-11, 14-19, 22-23, 31, 34-38, and 40-41 stand rejected under 35 USC Section 102 as allegedly anticipated by Smith (US No. 5, 020, 244).

Smith does make use of airflow relative to media.

5 Smith does not, however, make use of airflow to aid in media stabilization relative to the printzone.

10 In fact, the apparatus as disclosed by Smith cannot make use of the illustrated airflow to stabilize media in the printzone. As illustrated throughout Smith, interposed between the printzone, i.e., printhead 4 and support or platen 6, and the vent or opening 26 is a drive roller 8 and star roller 10. The purpose of drive roller 8 and star roller 10 is to propel media 2 “away from the print action where ink has been applied.” (Smith Col. 2, lines 26-31) Clearly the frictional engagement of media 2 at drive roller 8 and star roller 10 isolates any effect of airflow relative to the printzone. In other words, airflow provided at opening 26 of Smith cannot affect media stabilization in the printzone because of the intervening mechanical engagement provided  
15 by rollers 8 and 10.

Thus even if, as the Examiner argues, Smith shows airflow directional components into media, Smith fails to show stabilization of media within a printzone by virtue of airflow directional components.

20 Accordingly, Smith does not show, teach, or even suggest use of airflow to stabilize media relative to or within a printzone. Smith does not show teach, or suggest use of airflow to urge media against a support within a printzone.

25 Claim 1 has been amended to specify “a second directional component into said first surface, said second directional component urging at least a portion of said media against said support apparatus in said printzone.” Thus, claim 1 now specifies an airflow directional component “into” the media and also an airflow directional component contributing to stabilization of the media in the printzone.

Because Smith fails to show use of an airflow directional component into a media surface and urging the media against a support surface in the print zone, the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-5, 8-11, 14-18 as anticipated by Smith must be withdrawn.

Claim 19 has been amended to call for an “airflow as provided at said vent including directional components away from said printzone and sufficiently into media for stabilization thereof within said printzone, said media having print imaging thereon as applied by said inkjet printing mechanism within said printzone.” Thus, claim 19 calls for media stabilization within a printzone by application of airflow thereinto.

Because Smith fails to show media stabilization relative to a printzone by application of airflow, the rejection of claim 19 as anticipated by Smith must be withdrawn.

Claim 22 calls for airflow “with directional components at said outlet vent including a first component directed away from said printzone and a second component directed sufficiently into said media for stabilization thereof within said printzone.”

Because Smith fails to show airflow directional components sufficiently into media for stabilization thereof within a printzone, the rejection of claim 22 and its dependent claim 23 as anticipated by Smith must be withdrawn.

Claim 31 has been amended to call for airflow “directional components of substantial magnitude into said print imaging so as to be sufficient to stabilize media within a printzone whereat said print imaging is produced.”

Because Smith fails to show media stabilization within a printzone by airflow directional components, the rejection of claim 31 and its dependent claim 34 as anticipated by Smith must be withdrawn.

Claim 35 as currently pending includes reference to “airflow directional components away from said printzone and sufficiently into said media to stabilize said media in said printzone.”

Because Smith fails to show airflow sufficiently into media to stabilize media within a printzone, the rejection of claim 35 and its dependent claims 36-38 as anticipated by Smith must be withdrawn.

Claim 40 has been amended to reference airflow “directional components sufficiently toward said media to bear said media against a support apparatus of said printzone and thereby stabilize said media within said printzone.”

Because Smith fails to stabilize media against the support or platen 6, the rejection of claim 40 and its dependent claim 41 as anticipated by Smith must be withdrawn.

Claims 6-7, 20-21, 29-30, and 32-33 stand rejected as allegedly made obvious in light of Smith in combination with Martinengo (US No. 5,495,275).

Martinengo shows use of specialized heating plates in contact with media. Thus, Martinengo at best only modifies Smith with respect to a heating element. A combination of Smith and Martinengo falls short of the presently claimed invention in that it provides no stabilization of media within a printzone.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 6-7, 20-21, 29-30, and 32-33 as obvious under 35 USC Section 103 must be withdrawn.

In light of the above amendment and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Keith A. Cushing  
503-220-8575  
Reg. No. 32,407

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the US Postal Service as First Class Mail, in an envelope addressed to: MAIL STOP AFTER FINAL – AF Commissioner for Patents PO BOX 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date indicated below.

Date

2/9/04

Keith A. Cushing  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No. 32,407